G. R. S. 58]

Previous references.

1895-96

~~191~~ .

(L.R.)

File No. 270

Serial Nos. 1 —— 19

Later references.

R-52

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 —— 19

~~Part~~ B for

SUBJECT.

Complaint of Hasingalchatta of Mallur, Kollegal Tq. ?
Re: the Resumption of Inam Lands No 274 of Alur
village Chamarajnagar Tq.

Indexed:-
L S Rao

W D 1851—GPE—20,000—12-12-15

Before the Government of Mysore.

Revision case Appeal No. 2 of 1902-03

Appellant. Vs. Respondent.

Parties

1. Channigrabhatta
   Mullur
   Collegal Taluk
   Coimbatore District.

2. Venkatia
   alias
   Chamarajanagar Taluk

Stamp registry made by the Samasthanam Office of the Mysore Dt. of the land i.e. No. 274 (Kram) of alias village Chamarajanagar Taluk

Date of hearing 25.7.03
Notice issued on 8-7-03
To (1) under a registered cover.
(2) Respondent duly served

This is not a Council Case - Maybe therefore by the Revenue Officer

27/7/1903

Chamarajanagar

OFFICE OF THE DÉWAN OF MYSORE

REVENUE AND GENERAL, DEPARTMENTS.

Short Office Note.

* No. and date of letter, from whom, catch words to denote nature of Subject should be stated, in red ink.

One form may be used for more than one letter of the same file as long as there is space. The Office Note should be in black ink. Write only on side of this form.

*Subject (1) Pet^{n} No 3934 of 1895-96 from Alasinga Bhatta of Kallur, Kollegal Taluk complaining of the resumption of Inam S. No 274 of Alur in Chamarajnagar Taluk (2) Correspondence ending with Mysore Govt letter No 200 dated 9/9/02

Note

The petitioner who had obtained by private sale in 1896 A.D. the S. No 274 of Alur, Chamarajnagar Taluk complained to Govt that the Govt declined to receive from him quit rent on the land on the ground that the grant of the land as Inam had been resumed in 1880 at the Inam Settlement & that the land was in the possession of others who were paying the assessment thereon

Dem^r reported in his letter No 967
8/12/96 that the Petn^r's plea
of ignorance of the resumption was
untenable, as the resumption took
place 10 years prior to the petn^r's
purchase & as the petn^r made
effort to get the resumption cancelled
till 1894
The Petn^r then pleaded (on matter of) Revenue
rules the Dem^r to get the Khata
entries of names in the Khata
settled, as it appeared from the
Dem^r's report that the Khata
was still in the name of Venkata-
sastri who had died before
the settlement in 1880.

Dem^r now reports, after 5 years,
that the Khata has been made
in the name of both the petn^rs
& the necessary action in accordance

Patta a Cert. Cond. deed

Two drafts are put up for appd.

To Secy 17/9/02

Submitted to the Diwan through the Councillor

17/9

R. 19/9/02
474

20/9/1902

29/9

6346
29-9-02

The draft order rejecting the petitioners appeal against the order of resumption was approved by the Diwan & has been issued

The Diwan has however made the following remark on the draft

" But see Report. Joint patta.

seems to have been made. Do they not approve of Suits. Find out & take the necessary action. Sec[n] 68 & Rule 70 are perhaps applicable"

The Dy Com[r] Mad[s] be requested to send up the records relating to the joint partn with a report as to the provision of law under wh a joint partn was made

11/2/02

ofc does not put up Rpts.
4/11

The Dy Com[r] has sent up the records & report that joint partn was made ~~unde~~ in accordance with the Art[l] Consultation. Sec[n] 67 of C.R. Code seems to apply to the case. Shall the case be posted for hearing, notice being issued to both the parties?

9/2/03

Ag[t]

I do not quite understand as to what matter the further investigation is to be held. Please state what it is & what has to be done after giving notice.

20/2/1903

b

The Deputy seems to think that the Plaintiffs have been registered in the name of only one man under sec. 68 of the L.R. Code & Rule 70 of the L.R. Rules. The Deputy says the joint registry was made under sec. 67, L.R. Code. The question therefore is whether the joint registry was proper. If the joint registry is considered to be unauthorized, the parties will have to be heard & the registry in the name of one of the two will have to be struck off. Of course there is nothing to prevent a petition from the parties and a reference from the Deputy & the case will be a reversed one.

20/2/03

Let

A by a Committee of Council

Let me see the old Rent-Rules please. Was there not a rule which authorised joint pattas in force for some time? HJ
24/2

Rule 25 of the old L.R. Rules authorized joint registry in case where a khatadar left heirs divided in interest. But this was ~~cancelled~~ not retained by the new L.R. Rules as opposed to the L.R. Code.

HJ 26/2/03

The joint registry was made in Dec 1901 after the revised rules came into force.

The civil Court decree relied upon therein was passed on a decree by the two ~~to~~ claimants obtained by Compromise. S. 68 of the Code prevents (by implication) a joint patta. But S. ~~115~~ 67 is not quite so clear. The definition of 'occupant' seems to contemplate the possibility of more than one occupant for a land. I do not know whether any further notice is meant to be taken in the case. Submitted for orders. HJ 28/2

8923
RD 10.3.03

The Dewan through the AD Commissioner

R! 5/3/03
Camp: Shimoga 1931

HJ 6/3/1903

0526

We will [illegible] not
announced. Should
there was also an order to that
effect. Please ~~[illegible]~~
Is this one of the Council
cases? If so refer the new
Deputy for disposal on the merits
side - I am ~~[illegible]~~ inclined
that the doubt should be
removed - & a clear decision
passed - Such extended
from the new Council minutes
it may be sent to him for
disposal

11.III.03

13/3/03

1) Matter in working transfer & Mortgage
Registry in Village accounts have
been hitherto treated as Council Case
& all further action is to be taken in
this Case. This has to be posted
for hearing the parties.

2) This has to be treated as a claim
on the part of one of the 2 Khatedars

I have the entry in the name of the other
Petitioner amended (Rule 12 (1) (c) of the
Rules of Business)
14/3/03

(Sec)
This may be noted.
18/3/3

Submitted & seen
into draft.
29/7/3

11838/30.7.03
05447
The draft seems
to be unexceptionable
if there be no objection to
Council's proposal, I
suggest that
we do not understand it
31.VII.03

11/8/3 Dated 11/8/03
Submitted
The case was heard by the Council on 27/7/03
and it was decided that it should be referred to the Revenue
Department of Government. The case was posted for
hearing in pursuance of the Secretary's order, dated 16/3/03.
12069/7.5.03 Hence there is no delay.
The draft already prepared is herewith resubmitted.
Secy 31/8/03 Dated 31/8

Section LR

File No 274 of 95

Serial No 1

1895

No. 2288

Name of Petitioner, Thiruppa Mallappa

Village, Kadlur

Taluk, Kolhapur

District, Belgaum

Date of Arzi, 18-12-95

Date of Receipt, 7-1-96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, 7 Nos

Special Peon Dy. Col's order dt. 11.11.95 declining to order receipt of petition sent from petitioner in an uncalled land, on the ground that the said inam had been resumed & that other person had been enjoying it on full assessment.

Duly stamped & in time.

Submitted for orders.

Hdq Peon

21/1/96

It is explained to petitioner that as inam has been resumed he must first obtain order of the Inam Settlement Officer & then only he can file petition. He must also file petition within one month from the date of receipt of this order.

26.1.96

ABSTRACT.

Petitioner states:-

That in July 1895 Inam Claimants received Receipts for Provincial Rates, Cesses, Peshkash & Taluk Cesses from Revenue Authorities. Petitioner also paid the amount but Receipts were not issued to him. Petitioner's Inam Land is Uncultivated, Waste & Barren land. Petitioner has not enjoyed the land. Petitioner prays that Receipts may be granted.

Marked A.

The petitioner's Inam land is situated in Kadlur village, Kolhapur Taluk & District. The land is Uncultivated, Waste & Barren land. The land is not enjoyed by the petitioner. The land is situated in Survey No. 274 of Kadlur village. The land is not cultivated. The land is not enjoyed by the petitioner. The land is not cultivated. The land is not enjoyed by the petitioner.

for Rs. 5- a Chemical Engineer Valuer on account of his professional fees for the year 1893-94 - the account had been filed in Court on 23-6-94 when the Court fixed the 28th instant for hearing the petition but the petitioner did not appear

On 21-7-94 he submitted a petition stating that the Chemical Engineer acting for the Court had not appointed any representative and requesting that the account be forwarded to him for payment - On 28-7-94 he submitted a petition stating that the account had been received and he enclosed a cheque for Rs. 5 in payment of the account - On 29-7-94 he submitted a petition stating that the Court had ordered that the account be received from the petitioner - On 20-8

COURT FEE

EIGHT ANNAS

COURT FEE

EIGHT ANNAS

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. N.. 2288

2

3

4

5

ಸಹಿಯಿಲ್ಲದ ಪತ್ರ ೨೮-೧೧-೨೦೨೬ ನಾಳೆ ಸಂಜೆಯೊಳಗೆ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನ ಆವರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಹೋಗಿದ್ದ ಪತ್ರ ಇದು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನ ಆಡಳಿತ ಮಂಡಳಿಯು ಪರೀಕ್ಷಾ ಕೊಠಡಿಯ ಸಿಸಿಟಿವಿ ದೃಶ್ಯಾವಳಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿತು. ಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಕೆಲವು ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಮೊಬೈಲ್ ಫೋನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಬಳಸುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದಿತು. ಆದರೆ ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆದವರ ಹೆಸರು ಮಾತ್ರ ಎಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಪತ್ರದ ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇವಲ ‘ಒಬ್ಬ ಹಿತೈಷಿ’ ಎಂದು ಮಾತ್ರ ಬರೆಯಲಾಗಿತ್ತು.

ಈ ಪತ್ರದ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಕಾಲೇಜಿನ ಪ್ರಾಂಶುಪಾಲರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆದವರ ಗುರುತು ಪತ್ತೆಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಸರು ಇಲ್ಲದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ಬರೆದವರನ್ನು ಪತ್ತೆಹಚ್ಚುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ. ಕೆಲವು ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಈ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಸೂಚನಾ ಫಲಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಟಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ಆಡಳಿತ ಮಂಡಳಿಯು ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಿ ಕಡತದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಟ್ಟಿದೆ.

ಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಪರೀಕ್ಷಾ ಕೊಠಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಬರೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಕೆಲವರು ಪಕ್ಕದವರ ಉತ್ತರಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಬರೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಇವೆಲ್ಲವೂ ಸಿಸಿಟಿವಿ ದೃಶ್ಯಾವಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಕಂಡುಬಂದಿವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆದವರು ಯಾರು ಎಂಬುದು ಮಾತ್ರ ಇನ್ನೂ ತಿಳಿದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಸರು ಇಲ್ಲದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ಬರೆದವರನ್ನು ಪತ್ತೆಹಚ್ಚುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಕೆಲವು ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಈ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಸೂಚನಾ ಫಲಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಟಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ಆಡಳಿತ ಮಂಡಳಿಯು ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಿ ಕಡತದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಟ್ಟಿದೆ.

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ
2288ನೆ

14-2-96

Section 2(1)(R) 2R
File No 2704/95
Serial No 2

Dated 10-2-96.

By order

Draft.

2284/95

Ref 2961
12/3

Reference letter 10.3.96

Lady Stanford

Application to receive an order passed by the 2nd Commissioner on 26/11/95. The reasons now urged are the same as those urged at the original appeal heard and 18/12/95. The exhibits produced are xerox copies of the sale deed and the office extract has also been produced now.

Sd/-
Ass 14/3/96

Section LR
File No 270/95
Serial No 3

Sd/- [illegible]
16/3/96

Ass
16/3

Decision reserved. The case may be posted for the 17th inst. for orders.

17.3.96

Sd/-
16/3/96

Draft order
Ass 16/3 Draft

1896

No. 3177

Name of Petitioner, Vilvanathan Pillai
Function Executive Magistrate

Village, Mullur

Taluk, Kollegal

District, Coimbatore

Date of Appl, 26-2-96

Date of Receipt, 12-3-96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, 9 returned

ABSTRACT.

Petitioner has appealed against Revenue Divisional Officer's Endorsement No. 2284/95 dated 12-2-96 passed on his petition dated 18-12-95 applying for issue of Patta in favour of petitioner and others for lands purchased by petitioner and others by Sale Deed for Rs. 2700 from the Ryots of Mullur village, Kollegal Taluk for the year 1895-96 and the same was refused.

The petitioner urges that it is open to the Executive Magistrate to grant Patta in favour of the purchasers of lands in Ryoti Tenure, executed by the Tenants and that his request for Patta was refused on the ground that

owners.

With reference to the above-mentioned petition:-

(1) Whether the said deceased Swami died intestate?

(2) Whether the said deceased was duly entitled to the [illegible] land and house situate in the village of [illegible] in the Kandy District?

With reference to the above - that it is not necessary to frame issues by reason the Respondent admitted in the said affidavit that the petitioner is the only son of the deceased -

And further that the petitioner testified

(1) Whether the above named Respondent is the brother of the deceased?

(2) Whether the Respondent and the said Deceased were living separate from each other?

(3) Whether notice has been given to the Respondent at the time when the marriage was solemnized by post mortem the knowledge of the Respondent?

(4) Was there any evidence for the said Respondent to the contrary the Respondent's name has been struck off?

(5) To whom should the original grant of the said land be issued?

Keep that in consideration of the above points and issues I do hereby frame the following issues for the decision of the case of the Petitioner:-

(1) To prove the said [illegible] has been executed by post, mortem as Issue 2

(2) To prove the said post of the said Deceased from

-him

12/2

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. NO. 3/1896-97
DATE 12-3-96

ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧ್ಯಯನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧ್ಯಯನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಅವರು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧ್ಯಯನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Section LR
File No. 274 of 95
Serial No. 4

1-4-96

3197



By order

Draft

For Secretary

comp?

Bltr-

(9)

నంబర్
3197

Section LR
File No 270 of 95
Serial No 5 24

2961 of 95

Refer

Section LR
File No 270 of 95
Serial No 6

1896 (5)

No. 3457

Name of Petitioner, Nagappa Hattiangadi residing in

Village, Mollur

Taluk, Udipi

District, ~~South~~ Canara

Date of Arzi, 26.3.96

Date of Receipt, 6.4.96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, Two returned

Pet^r appeals against an order of the Asst^t Supt^t which says that as the Inam was resumed so long ago as in 1880 nothing can be done in the matter inasmuch as 6 years

Unstamped but Receipt issued pending the same

Council case (Petition, Counter, &c.), Nil (el)

Please see Councillor's note in Petn No: 2288.

Shroff
No. 15/4/96

Called for Councillor's Opinion
15/4/96

Petn admitted unstamped. Petr states that Asst^t Supt^t has misapprehended the nature of the application dated 6th March 1896 for the reinvestigation of the case long delay in appeal against the resumption the matter which was settled as long ago as 1880 cannot now be reopened

17/4/96

ABSTRACT.

Petn represents that in No 2288 of 12.2.96 Asst^t Supt^t has declined to admit the appeal to consider the Inam case on 25.2.96 (Petn & papers enclosed); that he misunderstands the petition in No 2288 of 95 (Inam enclosed) stating petitioner was settled by Inam Supt^t in 1880 of the Inam on the ground of absence during the Inam enquiry & that such misapprehension without an order from Pet^r

Prays that the Inam be confirmed to him after the resumption.

10.4.96

203700

Registered

Financial stamp for original

4.4.96

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
RECD. NO. 3700

I

2

3

4

ધ્યાન દોરી આપ શ્રીને આપની ફોન તા 26/2/96 સમય સંબંધે પત્રિકા

26/3/96 ભવદીય ઠાકોર વી.

Section LR
File No 2704/95
Serial No 1345

No. 3451

9-5-96

Remarks by Commissioner

Necessary report
Requisite attached.
The Inam was
resumed in 1880
when the Mala
purchased the land
in 1890. The Inam
Committee recommended
the grant back as
1880 & the Inamdar
Committee failed to attend
the resumption, the
matter cannot
now be reopened
Inam enquiry must
be opened in
Mala taluq.

28/4/96

Memorandum
addressed to
the Inamdar
forwarded -
Inam Enquiry
Superintendent
Mala

6/5/96

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

2041,2283,2284 ... 26 ... 7-5-96

Reference posted 12-5

Writ Stamped

Submitted with reference to the 2nd Condition order at page 15. 5-96.

A.S. 13/6/96 A.S. 16/6 16/6/96

Called for the Complainant's Counsel with regard to the Petitioner's pleader not attending the Court on the adjourned date.

12/7/96

13-7-96

Draft 13/7

Draft 13/7

Section LR

File No. 270495

Serial No. 7

1896

No. 3434

Name of Petitioner, G.

Village, Nallipalli

Taluk, Kallepal

District, Coimbatore

Date of Arzi, 25-5-96

Date of Receipt, 8-6-96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, 16

ABSTRACT.

3457

Writ of Summons to Counter Petition No. 3456 of 7-5-96 rejecting the petition of 26-8-96 being unstamped and informing him that his claim cannot be received unless the petitioner pays Rupees Fifteen the Court fee payable thereon during the Settlement and that the Court accepts the pleading against the Examination of the Counter Petitioner through the Counter Settlement was effected in the following terms:-

(1) The Petitioner was the inspection on 6-7-95 and 7-4-95 that Survey Case No. 274 of Nallipalli village which was forwarded by him on 30-3-95 contained the Survey Stones and that the Survey had been completed - Petitioner stated that the Survey had been completed - Petitioner stated that the Survey was done by the Surveyor, and they signed the Settlement Officer. The Petitioner and Respondent's Witnesses were examined by the Settlement Officer.

(2) The Court will investigate the Cause for stating that the Petitioner's Petition against the Respondent

Rec. Ltr from Advt
Marked

2

3.

4

5

25-5-96

for the Congress time if the following remarks filed as Exhibit with the petition were forwarded.

(1) Endorsement No. 1/26-7-94 passed by the Chairman, Nagpur Zilla on the petition registered No. 16 - (Exhibit-1) (Petitioner's certificate)

(2) Letter of the above Zilla for the payment of Rs. 1500/- for the land by Executive Engineer, Irrigation Division, Nagpur dated 1-8-94 (Exhibit-2)

(3) Letter dated 1-8-94 of the Executive Engineer, Irrigation Division, Nagpur (Exhibit-3)

(3) It came to know that the Petitioner's land No. 2074 has been reduced to part from Endorsement No. 171 dated 17-7-95 passed by him from the Chairman, Nagpur Zilla Parishad after hearing the Petitioner's Advocate and General Agent (Exhibit-4). On this the petitioner filed Regular Civil Suit No. 95 of 11-11-95 - (Exhibit-5). Hence the appeal is filed.

Prayer that the Decree passed in the Civil Suit No. 95 filed by the Petitioner Dagdu Indurkar may be cancelled by allowing the Petition as prayed in the Petition.

Prayer further that the payment of the Land may be ordered to be released from him from the Treasury.

Yours
Petitioner.

No. 967
Enclosures No. Five petitions and Exhibits from 1 to 5.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated Mysore 8th December 1896.

31

(9)

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Revenue and General Departments.

SIR,

With reference to your official Memo No. Pet 113 of the 16th July 1896, forwarding for report and expression of opinion regarding the admissability of appeal petitions as per margin from Chikkingry Bhatta of Mallur in the Kollegal taluk complaining of the resumption of Inam land (No 294 of Attur Village in the Chamrajnagar taluk, I beg to submit as follows:—

2. One Venkatapathi Jois was the Inamdar of land No 24 in the Attur village of the Chamrajnagar taluk. Till 1880 no rent or Cess was levied on the land. In the Inam settlement of 1880 the Inam was resumed by Government owing to the absence of the Inamdar and an assessment of Rs 0-4-8 was levied on it till the Survey settlement which took place in 1894 when the assessment was increased to Rs 4-8-0. The land was registered in the name of Venkatapathi Jois during the Inam settlement as well as in the Survey settlement. The Inamdar is reported to have died long before the Inam settlement took place. The land was in the enjoyment of one Veeranaiya who was paying Rs 1-11-4 annually to one Timmalamma daughter-in-law of Venkatapathi

Jois

(41) 22

Jois as Gutta till her death which took place in 1890 exclusive of the assessment due on the land. The land is now in the enjoyment of Veerathayya's son Basavaiya. The petitioner appears to have purchased the land from Timmalamma in 1890. Timmalamma took no steps to get the order of resumption cancelled while she was alive. The petitioner for the first time in March 1894 i.e. 14 years after the resumption of the Inam remitted to taluk 5 Annas calling it as quit rent for the land in question by a money order. The taluk authorities returned the money order as the amount of assessment on the land had been paid before the receipt of the money order and as the amount had not been remitted by the Khatedar.

3. The petitioner then appealed to this Office and an endorsement No. 95 dated 11th November 1895 was given to him to the effect that the Inam in question having been resumed by Government in 1880 it was assessed at Rs. 4-8-0 during the Survey settlement in 1894 and registered in the name of the Inamdar Venkatappa the Jois, and since the assessment of the land had been paid by his representatives no quit rent could be received from the petitioner.

4. The inam in question was resumed so far back as 1880 and assessed in 1894, and the Inamdar or his descendants or the petitioner did not attempt to get the resumption cancelled

till

Pl 113 [illegible] 67-7-96

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

To

The accompanying Petition/Note ~~dated~~ in the margin ~~25-5-96~~ received at the Dewan's Office from: Massa Subbu[illegible] of Mallur in the Kolegal Taluk, complaining of the [illegible] of delay in appealing to Court against the case of the [illegible] stopping/resuming [illegible] land No 274 of [illegible] Mallur in the Chamrajnagar Taluk are forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner of the Mysore District for report, especially with reference to the petitioner's plea for not appealing within the prescribed time.

After the Deputy Commissioner has reported [illegible] opinion regarding the admissibility of such plea and appeal.

2. The petition with its enclosures should be returned

By Order,

Draft C2

Secretary

BANGALORE, 16-7-1896

Bill 15-7-96

M.G.C.P.B.—19-2-95—1,000

20 2285 3 8 2-95
29 68 5 2-96
39 39 2-2-96
345 9 26-3-96
3934 9 25-5-96 Revised

Section LM
File No 2285 95
Serial No 20

bill. 89-; the title to land does not stand in the name of either the petitioner or of Ismail = amma who sold the land to him. The land was purchased after the same had been assessed by the Superintendent of Lands at 4 annas 13 lie. I am therefore of opinion that the plea of the petitioner that he was ignorant of the re = sumptions of the Inam title Act. 89- cannot be accepted as it was his duty to have made the necessary enquiries before he purchased the same.

5. The petitions and enclosures received with the above are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir.

Your most obedt servant,

Deputy Commissioner

of the Surpur District

Compd:
Ulg

1067

4676
Pet 432 1896.

From

The Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Revenue and General Departments.

Dated 8
Despatched } December 1896.
Received

Enclosures No. Three petitions and abstracts from A to P.

No. 967

Relating to the petition of Channaiya, Patel of Gollur in the Kollegal Taluk complaining of the assessment of Inam land to Rs 2-4 of Cotton in the Channapatna Taluk.

Submitted with reference to the Revenue Council Order on the abstract of petn No 3934 of 25.5.96

20/1/97.

The Dy Commr's opinion that the land in question, being purchased by petr in 1890 when the Inam had been resumed, the petr's appeal cannot be admitted

Subd to 2nd Councillor.

22/1

Rec'd 20th
22/1/97
Draft-Order & Draw
24/1

Bearing that the Inam Enclosure cannot be restored. Nor is the question of the remuneration of Inamdars in the State which can only be allowed to land in the name of the deceased Venkata Patel for the fault to all the Dy Comr Waste which reference will reflect the rent. If the Dy Comr proceeds in his petn in the name of the Patel then the petn entitled to pay the Govt demand until 23/1/97

Petition
15/1/97 21/1/97

Rec'd 19/1
Draft Order rejected.
20/1

1897

From The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore

To The Deputy Commr Mysore district.

Dated 5th
Despatched 10 } February 97
Received ✓

General No. 7102
R No. 207

Enclosures No.

Section LR
File No 270 of 95
Serial No 10

274

His letter No. 96-98/1/796 reporting on the petition of Hasingra Bhatta of Hullegal Taluk, complaining of the resumption of Inam land No. 24 of Alur in the Channarayapatna Taluk.

With reference to the above he has the honor to observe, that granting that the question of Inam cannot be reopened, there is the question of the mutation of names in the Khata which cannot be allowed to stand in the name of the deceased Venkatapathi Jois,

37

189 (11)

(40)

From

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

To

The Dy Commr:
Mysore District.

Dated 27th

Despatched 27 March 01.

Received

General No. Rel
No. 1442

Enclosure No.

Section LR
File No 270 of 95
Serial No 11

This Office No. 710/P 1267 dated 5th Feby 1897 calling for further report on the petn: of Alasinga Bhatta of Mallur, Kollegal Taluk, in re the resumption of Inam land No 274 of Alur in the Chamraj nagar Taluk

and subsequent 6 reminders ~~marginally noted~~. Ending with Rel 1176 & 20th Feby 1901.

Has the honor to draw attention to the above and to request an early reply thereto ~~without~~ any more delay.

By order,

Dcs.

~~For~~ Under-Secretary.

26/3/01

and to request that
if the fact is as the Pet. states
~~is requested to~~ will take action
with reference to it and report
the result. If the Pet. succeeds
in getting his name registered
~~they~~ he will be entitled to
~~his~~ her
~~for~~ the Govt demand.

By Order

HM

C2 Draft ~~For~~ Secretary

5/2

Bbn
5/2

Submitted
3-9-4-01

1900-901.

38

From

The Deputy Commissioner,
the Mysore District.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 6686
86-901
Pl. 431
SECRETARIAT

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue
Departments.

Dated 3d
Despatched } April 1901.
Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 971

Section LR
File No 270 of 95
Serial No 12

Reporting the steps taken on the petition of Hasingarambatta of Mulbar, Kollegal Taluk, in re the resumption of Inam land No. 29/1 of Alur in the Chamarajnagar Taluk.

The Dy Commr should submit a report as to the result after the expiry of the period of three months referred to.
15/4/01
15/4/01

Refer
6-4-01

Rd 8/4/01

Reply putup

All
8/4/01

(19)

notice has been issued under para 8 of Rule XXVI ~~thereof~~. Necessary action will be taken after the expiry of the period of 3 months fixed thereof.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obed. servant

K. Ramachandra Rao

Esq. Deputy Commissioner

Mysore District.

A-K.

39

No. 971

Enclosures No. -

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER.

MYSORE DISTRICT.

Dated Mysore 30 April 1901.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

Adverting to your memo docket No. Pol. 1442, dated 27th March 1901, calling for an early submission of the further report called for on the petition of Madinpandahalli of Kollegal Taluk, in the resumption of Inam land No. 2/4 of Alur in the Hanumanjanagar Taluk and in continuation of this Office letter No. 476, dated 17th November 1900, I have the honor to state that the Special Asst. Divisional Officer, Hanumanjanagar Sub-Division, reports that the petitioner having failed to produce a certificate of delivery of possession in pursuance of the decree passed by the Munsiff of Kanjengud, as required by Rule XXIV of the Mysore Land Rules, a

Ex 1301

From The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore
Revenue & General Department

(13)

To The Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District.

Dated 17.4.1901
Despatched
Received 17
General No. Pet
No. 1568

Section LR
File No 270 of 95
Serial No 13

Endorse No.

His Letter No: 971 of 3.4.01
Reporting on the steps taken
on the petn: of Alasingara
Chetty of Tumkur, Kollegal
Tk, re the resumption of
Inam land No 274 of Alur
Channarayapatna Tk. —

With reference to the above has
the honor to request that he
will be kind enough to sub-
mit a report as to the result
of the steps taken in the matter after the
expiry of the period of three
months referred to in the
report mentioned above.

By order.

Draft
Dt: 15/4/01

Rec 15/4/01
for Secretary

236

OFFICE OF THE
Diary No. 2708.
15 SEP 1902
Secretariat
Bangalore

19

From K. Ramanujaiengar Esq
Offg Secretary to Commissioner
Mysore

To K. Venkatapathiah Esq. M.A. B.L.
Secy. to the Govt. of Mysore
Revenue Department

Dated
Despatched 8th September 1902
Received
General No. 200
No. ✓
Enclosure No. One petition

Reporting the result of the steps taken on the petition of Ramajaiengar Bhatta of Mullur, Kollegal Taluk.

Put up Govt. rejecting the petr's claim for the Cancellation of the resumption of the Inam & stating that the Govt report ~~change~~ reports what is the Inam lands of himself & Veerathia

Send copy to Govt & petition

received 13/9/02

Off Govt put up NB 15/9.

Section LR
File No 270/95
Serial No 14

Petn 10.9.02 ✓

Refer for rep.
11/9.

Subd on 11.9.02

No 200
Certificate

Inspector of Council Office
Dated the 8th September 1902

From

W. Ramaraja Ayengar Esq:
Offg: Deputy Commr:
Mysore District

To,

M. V. Ramjundayya Esq:
B.A. B.L.
Secretary to the Govt:
of Mysore
Genl: & Rev: Depts:

Sir,

In reply to your endorsement No: 1567
dated the 6th instant I proceed subsequent
reminders calling for a report as
to the result of the orders taken on
the petition of Channaveerappa Chetty of
Mysore Kottegali Street, for mutation
of names in which persons Survey
Land No: 2/1 of item in Channaraj
-anagar Extn, is registered, I have
the honor to state that during the
Jamabandi of 1901-1902 the Land
in question was registered in the
names of Venkatachi and petitioner
according to the terms of the Compro-
-mise decree in O.S. No: 810/1899-99

on the file of the Nanjangode Munsiff's Court. Vide Mantadia Entry, Copy of which together with the remarks records bearing on the subject, received with the Chamrajnagar Special Sub Division Officer's Grade Rc: 1298 dated 15th May 1903, is herewith enclosed for reference.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obt Servt.

Offg: Asst Commissioner


Section CA
File No 270 of 5
Serial No 15

Section A
File No 270 of 96
Serial No 16

(56)

Proc of the Govt
H.H. the Maharaja of
Mysore

Read

Petn no 3734 of 1895-96
from Alasinga Bhatta
Kallur, Kollegal taluk
complaining of the
resumption of Inam S no
274 of Attur, Chamarajpet
taluk

2/ Correspondence ending
with letter no 200 d 8/9/02
from the Dy Commr Mysore
Dt reporting that
the Khata of the land
has been registered
in the name of the
petr & Veerabhra

1 the Jamabandi of
01-02

in accordance with a
Civil Court decree

Order thereon No. 583 dt 4.10.02 2nd file
P.R.45-02

(57)

The Govt decline to
interfere with the resumption
of the Inam which took
place so long ago as 1880
and ten years before the
purchase of the land by the
petrs.

75th
Mrs may give
Mrd

Hrs
24/10/02

Let
17/9/02

To the Dpty Comr Mysore Dt.
with the records rec[d] with
his letter No 200 dt 8/9/02

Hrs

J Price
C/C Edwardes Thyle & Co

4/10/02

For orders to issue Copy
Thanks

Court - re
revert.
Govt be
recon
recon
Is there
Board
Govt o
to the
recon
order
Govt
70
recon
order

3.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

189 17 1902

49

From

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

To

The Dy - comr. of the
Mysore Dt.

Dated 7/4

Despatched 7 1902

Received

General No. 779 P

PZ No. 45-02

Enclosure No.



With reference to this office
No 205 of 8th Sept 1902 referring
on the petition of Alasinga Chetty of Kadur
Kalliyalli, complaining of the
redemption of Exam: S. No. 274
of Alur, Chamarajnagar Tk.,
has the honor to request
that he will be good enough
to ~~reboot~~ send up the records
relating to the said patta, with
a report as to the procedure of
law under which a joint
patta was made.

Dfl-

13.

For Secretary

Central Jail Press, Bangalore.—20-7-99.—602.

NNB.

OFFICE OF
Regd. No. 1902 · 03
5 - FEB 1903

From Vet 461.
V. Venkataramanayya Esqr
Dy Commissioner
of Ellore Mangalagiri

To
H. V. Nanjundiah Esqr Dist
Secy to the Government
of Mysore
in the Revd Genl Depts

Dated 29.
Despatched
Received February 1903

General No. 656
No.

Enclosure No. one file

Section LR.
File No 2700/95
Serial No 18

Submits records relating to the complaint of Alasingara-chuk in re. joint patta of Survey No 274 of the Alur village, Chamarajnagar Taluk.

Pkt
5-2-03

27-45-02 Contains
reps copies &c
All
5-2-03.

Submitted
for
6-2-03

Proc of the Govt
H H the Maharaja of
Mysore

Read

The Board received with
letter No 656 d 2/2/0

from the Dy Comr,
Mysore Dt, and relating
to the registry of Sr No
274 of Alur Village, Chan
rayapatna taluka in D
Rama of Narasimpathalle
& Veeraiah

p/

order No 258-9
S745-0
d 31st August 03

The Dy Comr forwards
the joint registry under

1369
Mysore Manuscript
sent through the
1st Council

Read
10.VIII.03

Dewan
7/8

Sd/- Sriniwasa Setlur

Under this Secretary's order dated
3/7/03 Thothi was instructed
to call, Srinivasa and
Narain, on 3/8/03. in person, to
Dewan's guru Krishna Rao.

Dewan
Instructed to do 13/8/03
Dewan now through
the 1st Council

Dewan, 17/8 16/8/03

Sd/- Srinivasa

Sec 67 L-R. Code

53

As at present advised, that
the Govt. think, Joint (22)
Khata is not authorized
by Sec 67 of the L-R Code
and request the Rev
Cmr to have the
mistake rectified in
this case

24/8/03

12890
21.8.03

Subd (Miss Dewan)
Desai
26/8

03999
23.VIII.03

Desai
27/8

29/8/03

To the Rev Cmr in Mysore
with the record

The Dy Cmr. Mysore Dt.

Deputy Commissioner's Office
of the Mysore District

Dated Mysore 2nd February 1903

From

B. V. Venkataramiah Avargal Esqre
Deputy Commissioner's Office
Mysore District

To

H. V. Nanjundiah Esqre M.A. (Oxf)
Secretary to the Government
of Mysore
in the Revenue & General Department

Sir,

As required in your docket No 779
P.7.45.02
of the 7th November 1902, I have the honor to forward herewith the records relating to the Complaint of Nasenghabtalla in re joint patta of Survey No. 274 of the Alur village in the Chamarajnagar Taluk, and to state that the joint patta was made in accordance with the Civil Court decree, Nasingra Shetta and Venkatiah having joint interest.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant.

Deputy Commissioner's
Office Mysore District